



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,257	07/31/2003	Yun Xin Li	CML00843AC	1623

22917 7590 04/15/2009  
MOTOROLA, INC.  
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD  
IL01/3RD  
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER
----------

CHRISS, ANDREW W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2419

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/15/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.US@motorola.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/631,257	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Andrew Chriss	<b>Art Unit</b> 2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 15, 2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendment, filed December 15, 2008, has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-25 are currently pending.

3. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed February 9, 2009 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-25 based upon lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as set forth in the last Office action because the submitted declaration does not provide any evidence that the claim limitation "obtaining pre-defined modulated transmission protocol bits stored in a memory" is enabled. Per MPEP 2164.05: "Applicant may submit factual affidavits under 37 CFR 1.132 or cite references to show what one skilled in the art knew at the time of filing the application. A declaration or affidavit is, itself, evidence that must be considered. The weight to give a declaration or affidavit will depend upon the amount of factual evidence the declaration or affidavit contains to support the conclusion of enablement. In re Buchner, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991) ("expert's opinion on the ultimate legal conclusion must be supported by something more than a conclusory statement"); cf. In re Alton,

Art Unit: 2419

76 F.3d 1168, 1174, 37 USPQ2d 1578, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (declarations relating to the written description requirement should have been considered).” Declarant states an opinion that the invention could be performed as claimed by “actually modulating the limited number of possible protocol transmission bit sequences and then storing the modulated bits for further use” and that “pre-defined modulated transmission protocol bits' can be determined offline by performing actual modulation on every protocol transmission bit sequence and storing each resulting modulated protocol transmission bit sequence in memory.” Declarant's statement does not provide factual evidence that the cited steps could be performed (e.g., using equipment known to one skilled in the art) and therefore constitutes a conclusory statement. Specifically, no factual evidence is provided to support a conclusion that one skilled in the art could digitally modulate a payload and that such modulated payload could be stored in memory. Modulation is known in the art to be performed on a signal in order to be transmitted across a network (e.g., modulation on to a carrier by assigning an amplitude, frequency, or phase to the output signal). At a receiver, the signal is demodulated in order to allow processing components to interpret the transmitted data therein. Modulation is not performed on a signal for purposes of storage on a medium. For the reasons outlined above, rejection of Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is maintained.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2419

5. **Claims 1-25** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Independent Claims 1 and 17 respectively cite “obtaining pre-defined modulated transmission protocol bits stored in a memory” and “a memory storing pre-defined modulated transmission protocol bits.” The claim language requires that the pre-defined transmission protocol bits are already modulated as they are stored in the memory. Applicant’s specification, at page 8, line 11, describes the pre-defined modulated transmission bits are “digitally modulated.” However, Applicant's specification does not describe how said transmission protocol bits are digitally modulated prior to being stored in said memory. Known examples of digitally modulated signals (e.g., using amplitude-shift keying, frequency shift keying, and phase shift keying) produce *analog* results (emphasis added) in order for the signal to be transmitted over a medium. Applicant’s specification does not describe how such a resultant analog signal can be stored. The step of modulation requires “varying some characteristic of the electrical carrier wave as the information *to be transmitted* on that carrier wave varies” (emphasis added). There is no disclosed step of modulating the pre-defined transmission protocol bits, nor a disclosed feature that would show how a modulated signal could be stored. Therefore, Applicant’s disclosure would not enable one skilled in the art to make and use that defined by the claims of the instant application. Claims 2-16 and 18-25 depend on the independent claims cited above and fail to resolve the deficiencies therein.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2419

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 9, 2009 regarding rejection of Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that the filed declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 overcomes the outstanding rejection. Examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons described above. Therefore, rejection of Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is maintained.

### *Conclusion*

The claims of an application for which a request for continued examination (RCE) has been filed may be finally rejected in the action immediately subsequent to the filing of the RCE (with a submission and fee under 37 CFR 1.114) where all the claims in the application after the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 (A) are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114, and (B) would have been properly finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to the filing of the RCE under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Chriss whose telephone number is (571)272-1774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2419

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Chriss  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2419  
4/1/2009

/A. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Hassan Kizou/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419